DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 878 JC 690 074

By-Roberts, Dayton Y., Ed.

Local and State Relations: Proceedings of the Junior College Conference (Ocean Springs, Mississippi, June 24-26, 1968).

Florida State Univ., Tallahassee.; Florida Univ., Gainesville.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note-74p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.80
Descriptors-*Educational Finance, *Junior Colleges, *Master Plans, Public Relations, *State Legislation, *State School District Relationship
Identifiers-Florida, *Mississippi

Several speakers addressed this conference of the Southeastern Regional Junior College Leadership Program and the Mississippi Junior College Commission. (1) The balance of state and local relations (J.L.Wattenbarger) depends on current trends: the change from local to state or federal finance, national standards required by population mobility, more centralized control, better development planning, return to state responsibility, etc. (2) Educational reporting systems (T.Baker) should include data on instruction, administration, operation, and maintenance costs and institutional attributes such as students, staff, finance, facilities. A system should be distinct from its uses. (3) As financial accounting (T.Baker) needs different procedures for state and local use, and for professional, regional, and federal agencies, budgeting by program is currently preferred; e.g., in Florida. (4) State and local decisions on curriculum (R.P.Perkins) must center on who is to be taught, for what, to what level, at whose expense, how, and with what balance of subjects. (5) If occupational programs (E.L.Kurth) are defined by objective and goal, local colleges can cooperate within the state framework. Surveys can provide data on job and manpower needs. (6) Public relations (R.E.Schultz) must satisfy students, legislators, lay boards, parents, and educators, with different information for each group. (7) Pennsylvania's system (L.W.Bender) is reviewed in the national context of diversity and change. (HH)

JUNIOR COLLEGE

LOCAL AND STATE RELATIONS

JC 690 074

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LOCAL AND STATE RELATIONS

Proceedings of the

Junior College Conference

Ocean Springs, Mississippi

June 24-26, 1968

Southeastern Regional

Junior College Administrative Leadership Program

sponsored jointly by the

University of Florida and Florida State University

under a grant from the

W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Editor
Dayton Y. Roberts

Copies available from:

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Institute Director:

Dr. Raymond P. Perkins
Assistant Professor
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Program . . . . . iii-v

Preface . . . . . vi-vii

PRINCIPLES OF STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS
James L. Wattenbarger 1

AN EDUCATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES STATE AND LOCAL
Thomas M. Baker 18

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING IN JUNIOR COLLEGES STATE AND LOCAL
Thomas M. Baker 23

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS
Raymond P. Perkins 33

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS
Edwin L. Kurth 43

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN STATE-LOCAL JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS
Raymond E. Schultz 49

LOCAL AND STATE RELATIONS
Louis W. Bender 58

PROGRAM

Monday, June 24

Presiding:	Dr. Robert Mayo, President Hinds Junior College, Mississippi
Welcome:	Mr. Garvin Johnston, State Superintendent of Education
	PRINCIPLES OF STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS
Consultant:	Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director Institute of Higher Education University of Florida
Panel:	Dr. J. J. Hayden, President Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College District
	Dr. Charles Wright, President East Central Junior College
	Mr. F. M. Fortenberry, State Supervisor of Junior Colleges
	STATE AND LOCAL FINANCE -- RECORD KEEPING
Consultant:	Mr. Thomas Baker Director of Financial Affairs Division of Community Junior Colleges Department of Education, Florida State University
Panel:	Mr. L. A. Krohn, Business Manager Perkinston Junior College
	Mr. John Crubaugh, President Itawaba Junior College
	Mr. Grady Sheffield, Business Manager Hinds Junior College

Tuesday, June 25

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS CURRICULUM

Consultant: Dr. Raymond P. Perkins, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Florida

Panel: Mr. R. D. McLendon, President
Northwest Junior College

Dr. Bill Scaggs, President
Meridian Junior College

Dr. Floyd Elkins, Dean
Hinds Junior College

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

Consultant: Dr. Edwin L. Kurth, Associate Professor of Education, Head of Technical Section of the College of Education, University of Florida

Panel: Dr. Robert Mayo, President
Hinds Junior College

Mr. A. P. Fatheree, State Director
Vocational Education

Mr. Joe Lewis, Trade and Industrial
State Department of Education

Mr. Larry Otis
Vocational-Technical Coordinator
Itawaba Junior College

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS -- PUBLIC RELATIONS

Consultant: Dr. Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University

Panel: Mr. J. B. Young, President
Jones County Junior College

Mr. Marvin R. White, President
Pearl River Junior College

Mr. Harold T. White, President
Northeast Junior College

Mr. Ralph Sowell, Publicity Director
Hinds Junior College

Wednesday, June 26

THE STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE OFFICE

Consultant: Dr. Louis W. Bender, Director
Bureau of Community Colleges
State Department of Public Instruction
Pennsylvania

Presiding: Dr. Robert Mayo

Respondent: Mr. F. M. Fortenberry

PREFACE

One of the most important developments in the rather rapid expansion of the community junior colleges during the past ten years has been in the increasing emphasis placed upon state level coordination. The state of Mississippi was one of the very first states to establish a system of community junior colleges, planned in such a way that all sections of the state would be provided with opportunities for education beyond the high school. An essential part of this planning in Mississippi is the State Junior College Commission. The leadership demonstrated by this Commission over the years has been an important factor in the development of the junior colleges in Mississippi. The recent establishment by the legislature of the Office of the State Director in the State Department of Education emphasizes the importance of this concept in the continued development of junior colleges in Mississippi.

This conference was held in Mississippi to aid in the development of strong relationships between the state office and the local institutions. The Southeastern Regional Junior College Leadership Program under grant funds provided by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has been pleased to work with the educators in Mississippi in the development of this conference. We have been particularly indebted to Dr. J. J. Hayden, President of Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College District, Dr. Charles Wright, President of East Central Junior College and Mr. F. M. Fortenberry, State Director of Junior Colleges for their services as a planning committee for this conference.

Dr. Raymond Perkins of the University of Florida has served in an excellent fashion as Director of this Conference and Dr. Dayton Y. Roberts, Assistant Director of the Institute of Higher Education, has made an equally excellent contribution in serving as the editor of these Proceedings. A special word of appreciation should go to the Conference staff and participants.

October, 1968

James L. Wattenbarger

PRINCIPLES OF STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida, Gainesville

Mississippi has been one of the leaders in the junior college development in the United States. You hold a number of firsts. With the rapid growth of junior colleges in other parts of the nation, however, your position in the front ranks has been challenged by a number of other states. Changes have occurred which affect junior college growth and development in a considerable measure. Some of these changes are:

1. Changing patterns of financial support. All levels of education have become more dependent upon state sources and of more recent date upon federal sources for support. The local ad valorum tax has become a poor base for taxation to support education. There is even a discernable trend toward eliminating this source (local taxation) of funds in some states.

2. Population Mobility. The movement of families from one home to another has become a major factor in American life. This makes universal minimum standards of educational quality a very real concern to more and more people.

3. Trends toward centralization and consolidation. The development of the large corporation, the chain stores, the name

brands -- all these are found in business and industry. The development of multi-county, inter-state, regional, and national approaches to solving specific problems -- that is found in social and political life.

4. The Recognition of the Value of Planning and Coordination. The results of planned growth and development in business and the recognition of the value of coordination in industry led many people to demand similar efficiency in the tax supported activities.

5. The Reemphasis of State Responsibility for Education. Each state constitution as it was originally written recognized state responsibility for education. This responsibility was in turn delegated to local units (school districts) in most cases. Of more recent date, however, the state has been forced to assume more responsibility for maintaining standards and has exerted more leadership and often more control. This trend has accompanied increased state financial support.

6. The Recognition of the Need for Education. Increasing demands for educated personnel at all levels of employment, studies of income as related to educational attainment, and similar recognition of the value of educational opportunity have caused legislators and civic leaders to demand institutions to serve their home area of a state. Faith in higher education has at times placed these institutions in positions of serving as a basic requirement for industrial development.

7. Federal Support for Education. The increasing interest in higher education expressed directly through federal legislation

and federal financial support has given particular emphasis to centralizing at the state level planning and coordination and sometimes even approval.

These trends are merely indicative of a number of related influences which have affected the legislative decisions that resulted from study recommendations in many states of recent date.

As we look at the development of these educational institutions around the nation, we note, however, that the rather independent local orientation which nurtured the early development is no longer the major characteristic of community junior colleges. There have been changes operating in the newer developments of these institutions and even some changes in the older ones, too. Several states very recently have established junior colleges which are completely state supported and state controlled. In spite of the horrified reaction most of us might give to such an organization, some of these institutions have been very successful, even when measured by our very own criteria.

In states which in the past have demonstrated a strong belief in local orientation and institutional autonomy recently there has been a trend toward more statewide coordination and an attendant increase in state level responsbility. I am certain most of you are aware of several states where changes have been effected within the past six months -- changes which undoubtedly will affect directly the autonomy of individual institutions.

When the Community College Council completed its study in Florida in 1955 and made its recommendations, we became very much aware of the fact that there was an unusual amount of authority built into our legal structure at the state level. The experience which Florida has gained during these past ten years has helped us to define the areas of relative responsibility

which may be helpful in relating state to local relationships. Although most of you will be reacting to my remarks from the point of view of a single institution administrator, I will try to give you a viewpoint from the state level administrator.

It appears that there are a number of areas of responsibility which require attention as well as carefully developed concepts in state vis a vis local relationships. I would summarize these into six major groupings:

(1) Those responsibilities related to over-all state planning;

(2) Those responsibilities related to organizational structure and staff services;

(3) Those responsibilities related to policy-making and institutional management;

(4) Those responsibilities related to faculty and staff needs;

(5) Those responsibilities related to curriculum matters; and

(6) Those responsibilities related to relationships with other organizations and agencies.

Basic to the entire structure are two guiding principles of operation:

(1) Coordination is a basic responsibility of a state level board and should be expressed through leadership, not control.

(2) When there is responsibility, there must be concomitant authority.

Keeping these two principles in mind, let's examine the six areas.

A major responsibility of a state coordinating agency or a state control board is centered around over-all state planning. Obviously, this is an activity which cannot be carried on by local persons or by individual

colleges. There are numerous specific activities, however, which are directly related to over-all state planning. These require clear understandings regarding relative responsibilities which are assumed by the state level agency and which may be carried out by the individual institution. Among these are the desirability for the state board to act as the sole agency which collects and releases statistical information. One of the first things we found in Florida as we began to develop new institutions ten or twelve years ago, was that there were a large number of agencies collecting statistical information regarding enrollments, student costs, and similar very important data. We very quickly found that if individual colleges answered these questionnaires or provided information directly to the agency, not only was the information provided by one college inconsistent with those answers provided by other institutions, but such data also was often in error as the result of a clerical mistake and/or variant interpretations of the questions. This difficulty becomes particularly pertinent when one is dealing with a legislative committee and finds that information he has given is being challenged because different information has been provided from another source. Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon the state coordinating agency to assume responsibility for collecting information of this nature and to distribute it to agencies both inside and outside the state.

We have been careful in Florida, however, to make it clear that individual colleges can and should release such information as they feel desirable and necessary to their own local newspapers or other local news media. All statewide statistics and all reports and questionnaries which affect all colleges are coordinated through the state office.

Another major responsibility in the area of statewide planning is related to the establishment and development of new institutions.

These decisions are, of course, of great interest and concern to those institutions which are already in existence. In these days when every local chamber of commerce is convinced that an institution of higher education is essential to the health and well being of every hamlet, village, town and city, it is of greater than usual importance to make certain that there exists adequate planning for new institutions based upon fact rather than excitement. The state board must assume this responsibility. This activity requires skill, scholarship, and political aplomb. It cannot be carried out successfully without a master plan of development for the state which considers all elements of post high school education. Some of these elements most likely will be outside the particular responsibilities of any one board and, therefore, may very well also require interboard or superboard action.

A third area which has not received as much attention, but which undoubtedly will receive more as we progress is the need for the state board to give attention to the over-all planning for the scope of responsibilities each institution will assume. While the problems are not as difficult to solve relative to the community junior colleges as they may be in reference to senior institutions whose graduate programs often develop very narrow and sometimes very expensive specializations, similar problems, however, do become very pertinent in junior colleges as new and widely varied occupational areas begin to grow.

The concern for the increasing costs of education and for expenditures of tax resources will cause many groups to examine the budgets and to become critical of indefensible duplications of educational effort. The need for specialists even in the highly skilled technologies has a limitation and to go beyond it is to educate more workers than there are vacancies. A carefully developed set of guidelines for decision making must be developed as well as

an accepted method for making equitable decisions. Grants of funds unfortunately become a major impetus for decision making. These guidelines may be used to determine which institutions should receive special funds to develop new occupational programs and which institutions should not be permitted to expand in those directions.

These few examples serve to illustrate some of the responsibilities related to over-all state planning. The two guiding principles are particularly pertinent. It is impossible to carry out these responsibilities without authority but they can be effected most successfully through leadership rather than control.

The relationship between the state agency (board or staff) and the local junior college relative to the organizational structure and staff services is another area of responsibilities which requires very careful attention to the first principle as enunciated above: coordination is best expressed through leadership rather than control. The relationship of individual staff members at the state level to individual staff members at the local level becomes very difficult unless there is continuous recognition of this particular principle.

We have found in Florida several <u>modus operandi</u> which have been valuable implements for arriving at consensus and for understanding. The State Junior College Board very early authorized the Junior College Presidents' Council. The membership of this council is made up of the presidents of all junior colleges, with the Board's executive officer (the assistant state superintendent) serving as the permanent chairman. In this capacity, it is his responsibility to call the meetings, organize the agenda, and preside. It also is his responsibility to report the actions of the Council to the State Junior College Board, and to request further action for implementation where such may be required.

The Presidents' Council had been in operation for several years when it became apparent that there was a need to develop a similar organization for the academic deans; so, now the Council of Academic Affairs is organized and operates in a similar way with the Director of Academic Affairs on the state staff serving as permanent chairman of the council. The relationship between the Presidents' Council and the Council of Academic Affairs was a tenuous one in the beginning. It was necessary to clarify very carefully the fact that the Council of Academic Affairs was not a legislative body and could only recommend items for consideration and action of the Presidents' Council. Although the Presidents' Council, itself, is not a legislative body, it does pass policy recommendations on to the State Junior College Board for implementation. The Academic Affairs Council, on the other hand, only recommends such action to the Presidents' Council.

The Academic Affairs Council has become a real work session meeting, assembling at least six times a year and spending its time on problems of mutual concern regarding faculty, curriculums, programs, and related matters.

Similar working relationships also are established with the Deans of Student Services and with the College Business Officers. These latter two groups do not have a formal council organization, however, in all of these meetings, the state staff serves in leadership roles, both formalized and informal.

A third area where the organizational structure at the state level is particularly important is in the area of student activities. In this instance, an extralegal organization, the Florida Junior College Conference, has been organized. It became readily apparent, however, that this conference would not be successful until there was continuous state leadership provided for it. This leadership is now provided by a staff

member on the staff of the division who serves as executive secretary of the conference, and works with the conference Board of Directors in following through in the implementation of their policies. This Conference, incidentally, includes all student activities and is not solely an athletic conference, although athletics do take up the major portion of the time of the board of directors.

Here again, as in the other councils, decision making is placed upon representatives from the colleges, with the state staff serving as expeditor, chairman, and in a leadership rather than a control role. Authority to implement comes from the group itself in some matters, from the board in other matters, and from the law in only a very few matters. In all instances, however, agreement and concensus is to be most highly desired, and the activities of the state level staff must be directed toward that end.

In considering those responsibilities related to policy making and institutional management, a state board and its staff must walk a very critical path. There undoubtedly will be a tendency for a state board to "take care of" matters which comes to its attention directly. Such matters may involve the admission of a student at one of the institutions; or it may involve criticism of a faculty member at another institution; or, it may involve athletic policies at a third institution. These matters become particularly important when members of the state board disagree with the action taken by a local board operating a community junior college. It is essential that the state board recognize its limitations of responsibility by limiting its policy statements to those which affect all institutions rather than developing rules and regulations for the operation of a single institution. The state board actually cannot develop policy for a single institution without becoming an operating board for that institution.

Undoubtedly, instances of difficulties affecting a single institution will cause the Board to give attention to policies which will affect all institutions. Even when the problem appears to be localized and seems to affect only a single institution, the over-all policy statements must be carefully scrutinized in terms of the effect upon other institutions.

It is no more the function of the staff of the state board to interfere with internal operations of an individual institution than it is of the state board members themselves. Therefore, the staff must watch its approach to working with individual institutions also.

Here again, the attitude of the state board's staff is of prime importance. If the approach is one of leadership rather than control, comity will be maintained. However, in great measure, the competence of the local staff is the key to determining how far state control may go. When the local staff does not display enough wisdom and ability, the pressure is on the state staff to make decisions it should not make. A specific example may be pointed out relating to buildings and campus development. Where the local staff makes good and defensible decisions regarding these items of institutional management, there is no need for a great deal of state staff work. On the other hand, if the local college does not carry out its responsibilities, the state staff is forced to make decisions for them.

In these matters relating to faculty and staff needs, the state board may have several important responsibilities. The first of these is to establish minimum qualifications for faculty members. In some states this may amount to very little change, while in other states such a responsibility would constitute a great change. In several states, junior college faculty members are now required to become certificated. They may even follow the same type of certification procedures as is used in grades one

through twelve. In other states, certification never has been mentioned for the junior college level. However, the state junior college board must give attention to this problem, even if its decision is to assign such responsibilities to the individual colleges. The regional accrediting associations have, of recent date, developed more specific requirements for faculty members and these, in some instances, have become more stringent than the certification requirements were in former days.

It is quite probable that this development on the part of the accreditation agencies has come about because little attention was given or responsibility assumed regarding common standards for faculty qualifications at the state or local levels. In other words, the associations have reached a conclusion that they cannot place full confidence in the local people to determine what the qualifications of a good faculty member may be.

In our own region, there is a new standard which will require at least eighteen hours of graduate level work for college teachers. This is to say that fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen is not acceptable but that eighteen is acceptable. It also is to say that certain types of senior level work at an institution is not acceptable, while a so-called graduate course at another institution which may have a less defensible reputation is acceptable. You can see the kind of difficulties to which this logic may lead, but I am sure you can see also that this is not very different from the problems we have formerly seen in connection with other requirements. However, it does obviously become necessary for the board to set up basic procedures in regard to responsibility for determining minimum faculty qualifications.

In 1957 when the State Junior College Master Plan in Florida was approved, the Study Council was quite insistent that the presidents of

the colleges must be finally approved by the State Board. In Florida our presidents are nominated at the local level, but they may not be employed at their jobs until the state has approved them for the position. At first I, personally, felt that this was a very bad requirement and that it took something which was important from the local control. However, as time has progressed, I have become more and more convinced that this is not a bad requirement but rather good defense against hasty decisions. It has helped us in Florida to maintain a very high level for potential presidential candidates. It has removed in a number of instances pressures to appoint poorly qualified but politically expedient people for the highly desirable positions. This experience in Florida may well indicate another state responsibility which should be considered -- that is to place in the hands of the state board the final responsibility for approval of the chief local administrator.

I would also stress, however, that concomitant with responsibility to approve appointments should be the authority to approve the release of a president. The necessity for this type of reviewal would not have occurred to me a few years ago, but it has during the past year. While no man would want to remain in a presidency without the confidence and support of his operating board, the requirement for state level approval to dismiss would slow down the process and would prevent capricious action on the part of individual board members. It is obvious that there are specific areas of responsibility which the state should assume in reference to staffing.

Traditionally, the matters related to curriculum have been held within the close purview of individual colleges, that is to say, the faculty itself. We have felt very strongly that matters related to curriculum should be determined at this very basic level. However, when catalogs are

developed, the actual approval of items in the catalog is carried out by the operating board, and this has constituted the final approval of the curriculum.

When people look at statewide systems of higher education, however, the general public constantly calls to our attention very pertinent questions which we as educators do not answer satisfactorily. If freshman English is freshman English and should be required of all students who enter our doors, why is it that each individual college has a different name and number for the course? Is it defensible for such a course to carry different numbers and cover different areas of content in different institutions? Why is it not possible for us to establish guidelines which would in great measure determine the basic courses which are to be available at the freshman and sophomore level? While we shudder in some apprehension at this kind of approach, the average citizen often does not understand our shudder. He also often does not understand why we do not have commonly established grading procedures and testing as well as other matters which are related to the teaching of courses. It may become essential that we answer these questions satisfactorily, and at the same time develop common approaches among the institutions in those areas in which institutional autonomy is not of great import.

As we move into more use of computerized statistic gathering, I think we will find it will be much more simple for us to develop transcripts when we reach common agreements regarding course numbering procedures. While we already can accept this procedure as far as budgets and financial reports are concerned, we still have difficulty in reference to the curriculum itself.

Thus far, however, I have only touched the surface of curriculum responsibilities; therefore, let me take one deep bore into the heart of

the matter and see how you may react to it. It becomes more and more apparent as colleges develop a variety of occupational programs that the time will come when all colleges will not be in a position to develop all occupational areas. This is true because of two reasons: (1) cost of certain programs, and (2) the demand for individuals skilled in a specific occupation. Consideration also must be given to statewide needs which must be met even though the demand in any one area of the state does not have a great number of vacancies. We must find some way of determining equitable guidelines which will form the basis for agreements between institutions regarding their intent and ability to start new programs, as well as to carry on or expand existing ones. For example, imagine two junior colleges built within sixty miles of each other. One of these operates a program in dental hygiene which is serving quite adequately the population surrounding that institution. Suppose that the demand for this program is quite high and that college seriously considers doubling the size of each class, admitting forty students each year instead of twenty in order to accommodate the increasing pressure for admission. On the other hand, the college down the road just sixty miles away wants to start a dental hygiene program. It already has been determined that such a program can be adequately carried out with a basic twenty-student enrollment. If, however, the first of these two colleges doubles the size of its present student load, there will be no need for the program "down the road". Now who or what agency is going to adjudicate this kind of situation? Should college number one double the student admission, or should college number two establish a new program? If a state agency is making this decision, and if that agency is truly concerned about service to the students, it is quite obvious that the second institution would start a new program. On the other hand, if

everyone is primarily concerned about costs, it might be determined that the first institution could expand at less expense. It will not be an easy problem to settle. The situation will require not only the authority to enforce the final decision, but more importantly, special qualities of leadership in reaching an equitable and accepted decision.

The state board undoubtedly will be held responsible for the quality of the program also. This responsibility is one which has been traditionally and reasonable shared with the regional accrediting agencies. The function of leadership on the part of the state board in developing new areas of curriculum also is one which may be recognized as a state function. The responsibility for over-all state planning provides information which is unavailable to individual colleges. This information, when considered in terms of over-all state needs, places a special responsibility upon the state board.

The final area is concerned with those responsibilities related to relationships with other agencies and organizations. State boards have been established in most states by legislatures which expected such a board to become their major contact point. This responsibility is inevitable. The state board becomes the place where information is gathered, from which recommendations may be expected, and where a spokesman may be identified. This function is similarly expected by many other agencies.

When the concrete producers want a new occupational program, or when the hospital association wants a new in-service training course, the state board offers an excellent place to begin in the consideration of statewide needs. Staff and leadership can be provided here which will produce concrete results.

The state board also provides an excellent agency for arriving

at agreements regarding articulation between the upper level collegiate programs and the junior colleges. The leadership provided by the staff of the state board can be effective in developing policy regarding transfer problems and related matters.

Traditionally, however, higher education in the United States has been centered and developed institution by institution with little or no contact between them or among them. Many individuals will not even think of the state board. Some states will give their executive officer a high-sounding title in an attempt to overcome being ignored, i.e., chancellor, provost, etc. There still is very little recognition given to this particular office, although I feel certain the future will be different. There may be instances when the function of the state board and its executive officer will have to be asserted. This will cause pain upon occasion, but perhaps necessary pain. The authority to represent a number of institutions must truly be earned rather than granted directly. This certainly is the best and most likely the most effective way.

I have very briefly suggested to you six major areas of responsibility in which state coordinating boards and local operating boards must learn to live with each other. The division of responsibility is the important accommodation which must be made if we are to maintain the highly valued essentials of local operation. The attitude of the state board and the competence of its staff is most important, but of equal or even greater importance is the competence of the institutional personnel. The state board need not become involved in making decisions regarding internal institutional matters when the institution itself has operated responsibly and effectively in reaching decisions.

Finally, the modification of the exclusively local orientation of

community junior colleges requires that each institution give up some of its own decision making responsibilities to the state coordinating agency. The long experience which Mississippi has had in junior college operation once again offers an opportunity for you to develop basic principles which can prognosticate a future direction based upon sound experience in this new direction of educational development.

AN EDUCATIONAL REPORTING SYSTEM FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES STATE AND LOCAL

Thomas M. Baker
Director of Financial Affairs
Division of Community Junior Colleges
Florida State Department of Education

Years ago the responsibility for keeping records and reports in public schools usually was delegated to one individual. Since financial records were subject to audit and public scrutiny, there was generally more attention paid to maintaining the accuracy and completeness of the records than anything else. The financial information was mostly limited to salaries and expenses. Later, buildings and equipment were added. As the demand for information grew, additional object classifications made it possible to break down into categories the cost of education. It was broken down between instructional and administrative classifications with the additional classifications, such as operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, transportation, etc. Over the years, in the junior colleges these classifications have become more or less standardized. There has been an increasing need for additional reporting information in order to enable administrators to make sound educational decisions. An entirely new approach seems necessary in order to prepare adequately for making educational decisions and to explain to the controlling boards, the legislature and others the reasons why these decisions were made.

It is desirable to develop a total information system involving reports and data in such areas as employees, faculty, curriculum, facilities, and finance. Such an information system would be organized with the data needed for analyses of the total educational program. In 1966 the U. S. Office of Education began directing efforts toward such a system in the form of the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), which consisted of the following areas of interest: Institutional characteristics, students, employees, finance, library, projections and facilities. This year adult education has been added. In 1963, The Florida State Department of Education initiated the development of a state and local information system for elementary and secondary schools and junior colleges. However, in view of the shortage and turnover of analysts and data processing personnel and the transition to third generation computers, the development of this system has been delayed.

There is a difference between an information reporting system and a data processing application. A machine application consists of a predetermined amount of information entered into a computer. This information is scrambled in a predetermined fashion and a particular report is produced. The application is the method by which the information is translated into a usable form. On the other hand, the information system is simply the filing cabinet in which the items that will be needed by various applications are stored until the information is called for or retrieved. The information system must not be confused with the application. Neither is it desirable to combine the two into one system. In the information system, each application is independent. It is used as a file cabinet to serve as a source for the material needed in a particular application and changes in other reports or in applications which produce other reports and has no

effect on any other application in the system.

Traditionally we have considered that financial transactions in operations must be categorized by administration, instruction, operation, maintenance of plant, fixed charges, etc. An educational administrator must insist, for example, that while accounting is essential that really the dollar figure is simply one item of information to be included in a total information system. How can we organize an information system as a master file? A separate file should be established for each category of educational information. That is, student, staff, library facilities, etc. Each of the files should have information arranged as needed by various applications. The file content should contain all the items which have been identified in the past as essential in the making of educational decisions. It should be expandable in order to include items that may be needed in the future, but have not yet been identified. For example, in the basic file for staff, it would be necessary to determine and record all items necessary for report purposes concerning each individual on the staff. This information would be gathered, stored, maintained and updated periodically for current and future processing. Some examples of the sources of information would be the personnel records, experience and certification records, evaluation records, retirement data records, courses and number of students taught by each instructor, semester and clock hours accomplished by each instructor, etc.

In the case of facilities, a review of all available information and a collection of all factual and statistical information is needed to determine the use and needs of the facilities. The developments of items of information for use in planning, characteristics of sites, construction, equipment, planning of fiscal and regulatory relationships and standards

developed for health and sanitation, as well as limiting regulatory considerations such as accreditation surveys.

Each file must have a link or relationship with the other file. It is essential that all files be established at the same time and maintained on a current basis. If the finance file is to entail the basic information needed, it is essential that other files have information which relate to the financial data. For example, if a salary payment is made to a staff member and if the information concerning the assignment of the duties and responsibilities of the staff member is not in the file, an essential piece of information is lost.

In summary, therefore, an information system should be constructed as a completely separate entity from any applications needed by the organization. The organization depends on applications for its periodic reports and analysis required for daily operations, and these applications must not be disturbed in the process of building an information system. All files in the information system must be implemented simultaneously. The items in the finance file must be inter-related with the corresponding items in other files. There should be no item whatever in the finance file that does not have a relationship with the corresponding item in the other files. Other files should indicate the purpose for which the expenditure was made and the benefit that was gained from the expenditure. All files should be expandable without necessarily interfering with the address of existing information. This will reduce, to a minimum, the necessity of re-working applications as additional items of information are gathered in the individual files. When such an information system is operational the daily routine task of producing reports becomes a relatively simple matter of identifying the items of information which are needed and providing an

application program which will extract these items of information from the files, process them in a prescribed manner and print the desired output. The types of procedures for a large volume of information basically requires a large third generation computer with random access capability. Since, however, the file cabinet could be fairly standardized, it is not at all unreasonable to expect that every junior college could have access to the third generation capabilities within a relatively short period of time. Remote terminals, service bureaus, and regional processing installations could well make the benefits of a total information system within the grasp of even the smaller districts and smaller junior colleges wherein the expense may not warrant the purchase of a computer.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING IN JUNIOR COLLEGES STATE AND LOCAL

Thomas M. Baker
Director of Financial Affairs
Division of Community Junior Colleges
Florida State Department of Education

Experience since the inception of the comprehensive community college as a major educational force has demonstrated that neither the accounting structure nor the reporting procedures have provided the necessary information for sound decision making. The community junior college has generally adopted the reporting policies and procedures of either the elementary and secondary schools, the college and university system, or a combination of both. This initially presented no great handicap; however, with the junior colleges' evolvement of unique functions and objectives, these "borrowed" procedures and practices became increasingly inadequate. The need to give more meaningful information to controlling boards, administrators, the public, the executive, and the legislative branches of government accentuated the need to study the whole reporting and accounting procedures.

Many of the junior colleges have aligned their financial reporting systems in accordance with Handbook II, which was compiled by the U. S. Office of Education as a guide for local and state school systems, while others have adapted their systems to the College and University Business Administration Manual, Vol. I (ACE). Regional accrediting, federal and

other agencies are generally collecting data from junior colleges on the basis of the account classification in accordance with the American Council on Education definitions. This presents quite a problem to those colleges using the U. S. Office of Education Handbook. An increasing number of federal programs and the increasing use of computers made it more and more difficult to modify either system of reporting to provide data required as well as adapting reporting procedures to machine processing.

The type of information needed at the state level differs from that needed in each junior college. At the state level a system-wide reporting data bank is needed to justify the requests for funds to the legislature and budget commission and provide information for federal and state reporting, as well as for management information. At the local level, the junior colleges are concerned primarily with accountability and fidelity; and this requires more detailed recording of information for controlling boards, the community and college management decisions. The overlapping of these needs requires the development of financial reports and information concerning all activities of junior college education.

Education has never had available enough information to answer the questions that either have been or should be asked concerning the effectiveness of the educational enterprise. This is particularly true in the area of finance. Concentration in the past has been in developing costs for certain functions and costs for operating expenses. We have lost sight of the purpose served by these functions. Even if these purposes are defined in broad terms, such as vocational education, or general adult education, we have been able only to provide financial data in generalities rather than to be able to provide reporting information to enable a cost-benefit analysis of a particular type of program. The emphasis today is

currently in the word "program". Program has been defined in many ways. A good definition of program is an activity for which costs can be matched against educational benefits. We need more information to determine the real cost of existing programs and the real cost of introducing new programs. We need a type of recordkeeping which would give management the opportunity to determine the cost effectiveness and determine alternative methods of introducing new programs into the curricula which will produce greater benefits at less cost.

Program budgeting requires management by objectives and requires long-range planning. Reduced to a simple definition, program budgeting is a five-year plan adjusted annually with annual commitments for every year and a quarterly review of everyone's performance. Today, almost every junior college has an extensive accounting data system to support their budgetary efforts. However, there is little uniformity in various state systems. Virtually all the systems are concerned with their own legal requirements and responsibilities associated primarily with the receipt and expenditure of funds. No evaluation technique exists in the educational organization as it does in commercial or profit organizations. Legislators with 60-70% of their state's appropriations going directly to education are starting to demand answers. They want to know what is being accomplished for each dollar spent in education. They are looking for the most economical way of providing the educational program. They are reviewing formulae for allocating funds for current operations and for construction and equipment.

The rapid transition taking place in budget making involves a plan which will provide for information and which will lend itself to support greater decision-making and management. No longer can we say that

we need X dollars and expect our governing boards and legislatures to accept the figures without sufficient justification. In the future, we will be expected to plan for the most effective use of resources available to fully substantiate the need for these funds. This means a change from tradition which will require greater emphasis on institutional research. It will require that we develop formulae for cost finding, for determination of unit costs, and program costs. The principle of financial management emphasizes the necessity for good cost analysis. It will also require the use of computers in record-keeping and emphasize the accumulation of information relating to space, room use, and student station use. It will require more collective and long-range planning, and the collective needs of each institution in the system. It will also require that each college develop an educational plan setting forth the short-range and long-range objectives. For an ensuing year the plan would set forth new programs, additional facility needs, additional library resources, cost procedures, and enrollment projections, which would reflect the program needs and meet the purposes and objectives of the institution.

The American Association of School Business Officers of the U. S. and Canada recognized the need for developing new reporting systems in junior colleges; and, in 1966, established a Committee on Junior College Management. This Committee, in cooperation with the Institute of Accounting Research of Michigan State University began sponsoring in the Summer of 1967 workshops to develop principles and procedures of accounting and reporting tailored to meet the needs of the community junior college. In addition, many states recognizing the critical need for the development of good financial data have developed systems which will provide the necessary information for such management and decision-making.

If you will permit me, I would like to summarize the direction which Florida has taken in this regard. In the summer of 1966, the state superintendent appointed a committee comprised of junior college business officers, county school finance officers, and state department of education personnel to conduct a study of the existing financial management and reporting system in the junior colleges and report their recommendations to him. At this time, the system of accounting and reporting was in accordance with the K-12 system in Florida, in which the operating fund was maintained essentially under a cash basis and the capital outlay fund on an accrual basis. The committee studied the existing program in Florida as well as those in many other states and made a recommendation to the state superintendent that a new system be designed using as a guide the College and University Business Manual, Vol. 1. The committee sighted major objectives of the Florida accounting and reporting system as follows:

(1) To provide terminology and classification of accounts;

(2) To provide for budgetary as well as functional accounting and reporting;

(3) To integrate into accounting the internal accounts in the regular reporting system;

(4) To produce financial information on which timely management decisions can be made;

(5) To produce financial reports for all levels of management which are adequately informative and not misleading;

(6) To produce the financial reports which are compatible with other institutions of higher education; and

(7) To provide a base for cost accounting and analysis and program budgeting.

A private grant was obtained to underwrite the cost of developing the financial accounting and reporting system which will go into effect July 1, 1968. This does not mean that this is the final step in the development of the total system, but one phase in which standards must be developed in order to arrive at a program accounting system within approximately two years.

The accounting system will utilize two charts of accounts. One chart will reflect the organizational units or cost centers of the college. The other will set out the general ledger accounts, and for income and expenditure transactions will indicate source of revenue or type of expenditure. Using a code from each chart, "what was done" and "for whom" will be coded into each financial transaction. The account codes have been designed to enable each college to accumulate financial data according to several different classifications, i.e., by fund, function, organizational unit, source of income, type of expenditure, etc.. In addition the logic of the coding system makes it compatible with accounting systems processed on electronic data processing equipment. The funds which were used in the accounting system are generally in accordance with the ACE Manuel, i.e., funds for educational general support activities, for student aid activities, and for physical plant activities.

To aid in the analysis of financial information each organizational unit was classified as to the function it performs. Functions of the education and general support activities were administration, student services, general expense, operation of physical plant, learning resources, instruction -- university parallel, instruction -- occupational, instruction -- adult and other activities related to instruction, organized research

and contingency. Each of these funds or activities usually performs only one function. Therefore, the functional code for these funds is used to further classify activities within logical groups, i.e., function (1) in debt service is used to classify bonded indebtedness activities; whereas function (2) is used to classify indebtedness caused by loans, etc..

Developing a total financial accounting system would be fairly easy if all colleges were approximately the same size with the same organizational structure. The organizational structure of the college should be based upon the activities and services which it performs. We assumed it was not necessary that organizational structures be identical at all colleges since organization is influenced by many factors, such as purposes, objectives, programs, personnel, and assigned responsibilities of the college. Therefore, the functional chart of accounts included in the manual are used as a guide and do not have to be strictly adhered to as long as the organizational units are classed by the function they perform. However, the general ledger chart of accounts must be strictly adhered to.

It is difficult to determine cost of adequate programs. There is no single cost which is descriptive of all programs in the junior college. This is one of the problems in trying to determine costs in relation to other states. There have been few or no systematic attempts at identifying the impact of controllable variables on the cost of specific programs or to systematically determine the ideal mix of controllable factors to produce the desired goals at a minimum cost. If we assume that desired objectives are measurable, then the cost of obtaining these objectives is determined by a number of factors such as the administrative structure under which the programs operate, decision of the use of alternative instructional materials, types of instruction utilized in the mix of educational services to produce

outcomes, etc.. In short, we have no comparable data among states, and states use different definitions in computing them.

Our reports are designed to provide useful information to those persons and organizations who receive them. There are basically two types of financial reports -- external and internal. External reports are primarily stewardship reports to governing boards and general public. Internal reports provide supplemental information to college administrators and other personnel who have need for additional financial information to effectively discharge their responsibilities. External reports consist of daily, monthly, quarterly, and annual reports. Internal reports will vary in number, frequency, and content. Some of the internal reports used in junior colleges are:

(1) Budgetary reports at monthly, quarterly intervals to heads of organizational units. These reports may be in summary form or may report each transaction and including budgeted revenues and expenditures, actual revenues and expenditures, encumbrances, and unencumbered balances;

(2) Periodic analysis for each organizational unit comparing budgeted and actual expenditures for each general ledger code;

(3) Monthly trial balances for each fund;

(4) Monthly profit and loss statements for auxiliary enterprises;

(5) Periodic reports of cash on hand and in banks;

(6) Cash forecast and projection;

(7) Periodic reports on investments and investment earnings;

(8) Periodic reports on gifts and grants received;

(9) Monthly schedule of returned checks;

(10) Monthly report of delinquent notes receivable; and

(11) Periodic report of furniture and equipment assigned to each organizational unit.

Cost allocation procedures: There are many kinds of cost accounting but for an educational institution it can be defined as a process of determining the costs of teaching a student a unit of instruction. It should not be confused with budgetary accounting, which is the process for determining the costs of operating an organizational unit of a college. A unit of instruction may be anything, a student contact hour, a semester hour, a quarter hour of credit of course enrollment, a full-time-equivalent student, a course or program of instruction, etc. The cost accounting system which was developed in Florida to take effect July 1 uses the building-block approach i.e., determining the cost for the smallest possible unit. This will be the student contact hour. By using multiples of this unit cost it will be possible to determine costs of larger units such as semester hour, credit course enrollment, etc..

Computing unit costs: There are a number of steps in computing unit costs. Identify the instructional activities (courses) of each instructional organizational unit; charge each instructional activity with the direct expense which is incurred for it (only use faculty salaries; allocate other salaries and current expenses for each unit of instruction on the basis of the student contact hour). Distribute salaries and current expenses of the administrative function, general expense, operation and general maintenance of plant, library resources, and research function (on the basis of the total dollar spent); allocate salaries and current expenses of the student function, instructional administration and cost distributed to each instructional unit (on the basis of contact hour); and these costs in turn can be allocated to

the instructional activities of each organizational unit. Identify the building space occupied and the equipment utilized by each organizational unit within the educational and general function of the college and compute the depreciation charge for these facilities; allocate depreciation charges to the instructional organizational unit (on the same basis of student cost and hour); divide the cost of instruction unit in each activity by student contact hours to arrive at the cost of instruction per unit of instruction. The information accumulated in these steps provides the basis for almost any cost analysis an institution might want to make.

STATE AND LOCAL RELATIONS

Raymond P. Perkins
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Florida, Gainesville

Before we get into the purpose of this session, let me transmit a request to this group. I think someone has recognized an opportunity and is capitalizing on it. It isn't often that this many people are assembled into one body which can speak expertly about junior college-age people, and it is this element which apparently inspired the question.

I have been asked to ask you to lend a few minutes of your time to provide some important advice. Would each of you take one of the 3 x 5 cards which are being distributed?

Now that you have the card, please suggest a one-meal menu (noon) for a group of junior college-age people. This would be a meal to be served here to a group which is coming in next week. You do not need to know or indicate quantities; a simple list of dishes will suffice.

Since I have no information concerning the size of the group, or other details, please make whatever assumptions you like about these and related matters.

Now that you have completed the menu, will you examine this (projectual) list of possible influences on or reasons for selecting particular items to include in a menu. On the reverse side of the cards you used to record the menu, there is a space for you to list any "reasons for choice"

which do not appear on this list. Would you write out any additional influences which you were aware of.

In the indicated space on the cards, please record the following items of information:

1. Additional "reasons for action".
2. The "most" and "second most" important influences on your choice of menu items.
3. The amount of change in your original menu you would make under each of the following circumstances:
   - N. These young people have been cured of but are still recovering from a debilitating disease.
   - O. All are female.
   - P. All are male, doing heavy work.
   - Q. All are Japanese natives, 1st U.S. meal.
   - R. Soldiers, last stop before Viet Nam.

Thank you for your cooperation, and now let's move on to what we came for, some reflections on curriculum.

"Curriculum" has been given many definitions. One of the most all-inclusive is "...any activity under the sponsorship and/or control of the school."

For the moment, let's accept this definition and look behind - that is, examine the "why" of curriculum.

If curriculum represents the deliberate manifestation of the institution's efforts to fulfill the goals and purposes set by or for those who make the institution possible, then the goals and purposes must come first. Neither can any evaluation of curriculum have the least meaning aside from the purpose for which it is intended.

Under the very broad definition previously suggested, curriculum includes both intentional and unintentional effects. One of the most common and easily understood examples of what we might call the "subtle curriculum" is the effect generated by our grading system.

As you all know, from observation and personal experience, there is often a variance between intent and outcome.

But, I digress. This does, however, have a great deal of bearing on our purpose here this morning, even though we will concentrate on the intentional aspects of curriculum.

Even further back in the process of curriculum development than goals and purposes, and exercising great influence on them, is the fundamental philosophy of the culture or group by whom the schools are operated. Although they may never be considered at the conscious level, the purposes and goals reveal the answers to the following questions:

1. Who should be educated?
2. For what should they be educated?
3. To what level?
4. At whose expense?

Underpinning all of these is the most important question of all:

5. Why should there be education?

You see, each possible answer to each of these questions will have an impact on what the educational system attempts to do.

Most efforts to educate have multiple purposes, with some aims receiving more emphasis than others. A perfectly legitimate educational aim could be, and often is, the perpetuation and transmission of the culture. Somewhat more rare, but certainly no less appropriate is the aim of altering the culture. An example of the latter would be Hitler's program.

Some of my colleagues, usually the ones whose ivory tower status is higher than mine, contend that the hope-for outcome of any educational activity should be stated in "behavioral terms and have well defined minimum standards." I make no fundamental argument about this - except when carried to the extreme. I do not think it would be especially helpful to advertise that our accounting program graduates are seventy-five per cent accurate - yet this is what they are. Would you like to be the patient of a surgeon who made the right decision nine times out of ten - or even 95% of the time?

What are some other factors which influence the shape, size and content of curriculum? It seems rather fundamental, but we sometimes overlook the central importance of students in this issue. After all, this is the basis for the whole thing, isn't it? All we expect the curriculum to do is produce certain desirable changes or reinforcements in students.

This last point is also a crucial one - the very presence of a curriculum announces that we have made some judgement about what can and will produce these changes.

I see the results of our menu survey are in. Let's take just a moment to examine the outcome. We won't look into the actual choice of dishes to be served, but concern outselves with the reasons.

Of the "reasons for actions" listed, the winner, sixteen votes to seven, is "appeal to junior college age people." Second place goes to "nutritional balence," with five choices each, "what I would like" and "standard items - expected" tied for third place. It is interesting to note that the main dish items vary from roast beef to chicken, even though the choices were all influenced by the same reasons.

What implications does this have for curriculum? It is my contention that the array of course offerings in a junior college has much in common with a menu. The same things which influence what we would recommend for a meal will be important in our selection of the curriculum. Look again at this list of "reasons" we used earlier for the menu exercise.

a. Ease of serving

b. Nutritional balance

c. Appropriate to setting

d. Economy of purchase/preparation

e. What I would like

f. Appeal to junior college age people

g. Standard items - expected

h. Departure from routine

i. Staff could prepare and serve well

These plus the additions you may have made would, in all probability, constitute the general bases for most selection decisions when the curriculum of a junior college is formulated. At least, each of these has an educational counterpart.

Returning to the menu exercise again, we find that the persons who were most strongly influenced by "appeal to junior college age people" divided as follows on the question of the changes to be made for adapting their original menus to Japanese students:

Amount of Change:	All	Much	½	Some	None
Percent of people:	25.0	6.25	12.5	25.00	31.25

What are the implications of this? Of course, many interpretations would be possible. One we might consider, a rather obvious one, is that between three-fourths and two-thirds of the people in this group would make

some change in recognition of this condition. One must also ask, how many would change to make the menu more appropriate to the tastes and expectations of Japanese students? How many others made rather opposite changes because they wished to "Americanize" those who came from a different environment? Would not those who chose to change nothing have probably acted out of the same set of intentions and desires?

A very important conclusion possible from this is that we can arrive at the same conclusion by different lines of reasoning and we can do very different things for the same purpose. And, here we have completed another circle -- we're back to the central importance of the purposes, aims, goals, objectives, or whatever term you wish.

An illustration may be in order. Although the stated objectives of educational institutions tend to be much alike, some junior colleges operate their curriculum "menu" as a cafeteria; others bear a great resemblance to a smorgasbord; others remind me of the chain of cafeterias I know in Texas. This chain serves only one kind of meat. You may obtain chicken, pork, or beef -- but, it will be barbecued. You have your choice of any kind of vegetable you want -- so long as potato salad and pinto beans will do. The desert is always sliced peaches. There is much to be said for each of these approaches, educationally as well as gastronomically.

At the system or institutional level we state intents or objectives in rather sweeping and broad generalities. The more nearly we approach the student in the process, the more specific we must be in stating our intentions, particularly if we wish to make any realistic evaluation of how well we have succeeded in doing what we wanted to do.

Before leaving the analogy of the menu, another look at the conditions we introduced earlier in relation to changes in the menu might

be in order. You see, each of these also has some educational counterparts. Take the first condition listed, "cured of but still recovering from a debilitating disease," does it matter that the disease might have been "wheel fever", or "girlitis", immaturity, laziness, lack of purpose, or whatever? It should also be rather obvious by now that, if we haven't already, we'd be wise to expect having to accommodate students who come from a culturally different background.

The central importance of the student also tends to become lost in the day-to-day operation of this educational enterprise. One way this happens is the result of our thinking process. Examine the typical rows-of-boxes with connecting lines which constitute an organizational chart. There are those boxes which are set aside, with lines going to them and ending there. Some of the lines are broken or dashed; perhaps indicating that we can turn these people off and on at will. But, the really important connections are those which branch as we move away from the central or top unit.

Typically, the policy making body is represented by the highest rectangle, with connecting lines extending through the president where they branch into deans (or some equivalent), and then on through the faculty. Some place below all this, either by implication or being represented as another long "box" is the student body. These lines are labeled "authority".

By the simple act of inverting this chart and changing the label on the lines to "support", our way of thinking is changed. Isn't this more congruent with our avowed purposes? Isn't the real function of any school to support the student in his efforts? Education is about the only thing in which mankind must begin anew with each generation. Not that what one generation learns or adds to learning is lost; but, unlike most changes,

such as the general increase in physical height which tends to come with each wave, none of what one man learns can be transmitted to his progeny through heredity. If our purpose then is to transmit what those who have gone before learned, sparing those who follow the need for unnecessary trial-and-error and scars, then we should see our role as expediters -- not as controllers. This is somehow a bit easier to do when the lines on the chart read "support" instead of "authority".

Inverting the organizational chart makes another point clear. When the chief administrative officer is seen as supporting the entire structure, the importance of balance becomes obvious. If one portion of the program and administrative structure becomes disproportionately large, the task of supporting the entire operation becomes even more difficult.

What has all this to do with State and Local Relationships in Curriculum? Let us review briefly the central points:

1. We must first decide who will be educated, for what, to what level, and at whose expense.
2. The curriculum is chosen, as a menu, to fulfill the conditions set up in number 1.
3. Our involvement in the mechanics may cause us to lose the central importance of the student in the process.
4. Balance among the elements of the program is essential if the pre-branch units are to be efficient.

When one begins to consider a state system of junior colleges, the definition of "community" changes. What is a community? If what happens, educationally, in one corner of the state has no impact on any other part, this is a community, by some definitions. When there is movement of people from one part to another, when all parts must be mutually involved in

supporting each other, then "community" includes the entire state.

Since neither the local college nor the state office can see or know all the dimensions of need -- pupil, industry, culture, and community -- decisions must be cooperative. When comparing the local community college and the state office, it might be said that one is too near the trees to see the forest while the other is too far from the forest to see the trees. Together, they can recognize all of the pertinent dimensions of the situation.

When junior college presidents get together to work in concert toward the solution of mutual problems of their institutions, the typical considerations concentrate on finances and legislation. In fact, by the time that the necessary treatment of these subjects has been accomplished, time has usually expired. One way to provide additional time and opportunity for the consideration of curriculum problems is a system which was developed in Florida, the Council of Academic Affairs.

The Council of Academic Affairs and its responsibilities can best be descrbied by quoting from the Florida State Department of Education publication, Florida Public Junior Colleges, The Department, April, 1967.

> Council of Academic Affairs - The Council of Affairs consists of the chief academic officer(s), as appointed by the president, of each of the junior colleges and the Director, Academic Affairs, Division of Community Junior Colleges, who is Chairman of the Council. The Council serves in an advisory capacity to the Council of Presidents. It develops recommendations of state-wide concern relating to all academic matters, and the Chairman of the Council

transmits these recommendations to the Council of Presidents for appropriate action.

With the support of the state level continued through the administrative officer of any single institution must be concerned with the balance of the structure and effort which he is "supporting" (according to the inverted chart we suggested), so must the individual institutions recognize that the supportive role of the state level office can be assisted or handicapped by the manner in which individual members of the system cooperate to provide a balanced operation or attempt to pursue single goals without regard for other elements.

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

Edwin L. Kurth
Associate Professor of Education
Head of Technical Section of the College of Education

I. Introduction

Terminology appropriate to the discussion was introduced first. The following terms were listed:

Occupation - Any activity (work) which one engages in to earn a living.

Program - A plan of procedure

Occupational Programs - All those programs concerned with vocational, technical, paramedical, distributive, cooperative and home economics training.

Curriculum - A systematic and sequential grouping of courses for fulfilling educational objectives.

Currently semantics are of particular importance in defining specific programs which are funded from specific sources. This is especially true in the case of federal funding which is encouraging a broader program of opportunity but which now requires a better accounting of funds spent on occupational programs. There is a need to distinguish between objectives and goals: Objectives are general purposes that are pursued over a long period of time, unquantified, and of permanent direction; goals are specified for a definite period of time and are usually quantified -- the number of

something or other such as machines or graduates.

II. What Changes are Occurring in Occupational Education?

It is apparent that many Mississippi junior colleges are staying current and that the local communities are meeting their indicated needs. No junior college can operate as an island unto itself but rather must accept its place within the state framework. There is much evidence that the Mississippi institutions are working together both within the state and between states.

Evidence for the current widespread interest in occupational education was noted from the wealth of publications containing such references. These include Compact, Southern States Workshop, U. S. Chamber of Commerce literature, Christian Science Monitor, Saturday Review and the governmental surveys and university studies.

There is a general need for more and more people to have more and more education. Fewer manipulative skills and more technical knowledge is being required. Cooperative programs between in-school and on-the-job training are becoming increasingly popular. There are currently 119 schools including some junior colleges which offer cooperative occupational programs. There are now many more people in the service industries than in production. In 1950 there were 15 and 25 million workers respectively in production and service while in 1965 these figures had grown to 24 and 60 million respectively. The absolute level of education being required by industry is much higher than ever before. By 1970 it is estimated that one-half of all jobs will require post-high school education. With increasing job complexity and sophistication only unskilled and semiskilled workers can "get by" with a high school preparation or less.

III. What Significant Trends are Noted in Our Population Structure?

1. Age group 65 and over - definitely increasing.
2. Age group 35-64 - increasing in numbers but represent only 8% of the total population.
3. Age group 25-34 - a major bulge in the population.
4. Age group 18-24 - some leveling off.
5. Age group below 18 - some decline due to decreased birth rates.

Definite implications noted from the above are that different types of counseling will be needed for senior citizens and shifts can be expected (and in fact, have been observed) in the health related professions as a result of Medicare and the lower birth rates.

A chart was displayed showing the effect of a new industry (of 350 jobs) on the total community life in terms of allied needs, services and inputs. These 350 new jobs would generally mean 1,000 more people, 270 families, 19 blind persons, 67 aged, 400 cars and 7 more classrooms to mention only a few of the related changes.

IV. How Does one Establish Criteria for Program or Course Offerings?

This is handled basically through the surveys which include consideration of the total needs of the community and its people. The influence which Medicare, for example, has had on the needs in health-related occupations can be met by junior colleges. Workers in this area need not have a great deal of education but rather much empathy and logically would be found in the older labor force. Such persons must be reached for counseling. They are not a standard captive audience but rather volunteers for learning. Generally junior colleges are not geared for this service.

Panel Discussion

Members: Dr. Robert Mayo, Mr. A. P. Fatheree, Mr. Joe Lewis, Mr. Larry Otis.

The cooperative program of Hinds Junior College with a metal working industry was described. In this program students are paid for factory work and receive academic credit. There is difficulty in keeping the young men in school. Related questions included: Is this philosophy good? and What are others doing?

This particular plant is experimental and is approved at the State level. The program is actually more like that of high school distributive education (60% of the trainees' time is spent in school). It was suggested that the company should not allow the dropout situation to continue since this is a natural temptation for a young person with a steady income. The group was advised that the staff at the state level is to be expanded to include a full-time cooperative coordinator.

In reviewing other technical education programs it was noted that such states as Michigan and Pennsylvania favor cooperative programs while California does not. In addition to the scheme of spending approximately half of one's time at school and half on the job, other systems alternate by semester or quarter between school and the job. The latter is likely more normal and problem-free.

The overriding problem is to prevent industry from hiring students before they have finished their academic course. Industry is successfully attracting students after one year because of (1) poor counseling, (2) labor shortage or (3) high-level training. It is necessary to clearly define the limits of industry and the junior colleges concerning employment rights (there is a fine line between employment and exploitation). An industry

may use a training program to secure good but inexpensive help. A written agreement between training schools and industry is needed.

The total content of the trainee's education includes that which he brings with him, that which he learns on the job and that which he gains from the curriculum content. More supervision of students on the job is needed to assure the total curriculum program. The cooperative program (1) trains people on the job and exposes them to the differences of various jobs and (2) gives a broader range of knowledge to fill various types of jobs. Students are thus called upon to learn several aspects of a given industry and not merely a single job which in turn suggests the benefits of concentration on "cluster training" in junior colleges. A machinist operating different machines is not cluster trained but an electronics trainee can go into communications, controls or instrumentation.

In establishing a curriculum it is necessary to determine what (1) must be known, (2) should be known and (3) would be desirable to know.

At Mississippi State, a curriculum laboratory is charged with developing vocational-technical programs which are based on inputs from teachers, authenticated by industry and finally sent to the schools. Various grants and funds will be used to expand this curriculum laboratory to include all occupational areas.

In discussing mutual problems the ever-present triad of lack of time, money and personnel were mentioned.

The question of standards in vocational programs and the availability of future funds in occupational areas was injected into the discussion. Projections and plans for the vocational-technical programs on a five-year basis are based on better and better research. That is, specific needs are determined for various areas. The State Vocational Commission must approve

programs submitted through the junior college State Supervisor, but where the need has been shown the program has been approved. Information from local surveys and local advisory committees has been used as the basis for approval of programs.

In a "special legislative report", the group was told that the legislature is greatly in support of vocational education and over half of the vocational allotment goes to junior colleges. The Vocational Commission asked for $13.5 million and the Budget Commission recommended $9.0 million. This figure has been introduced into the senate. Anything less will result in idle shops and a proportionate reduction in laboratory usage.

Presently, high school vocational-technical programs are rapidly being approved. Perhaps this is significant since the high school product will be nearly as well trained as the present junior college product. Thus, the need for continual upgrading is indicated. There is a general movement to allow high schools to use junior college facilities on a time-shared basis, thus enhancing utilization of facilities. In some cases it is felt that a disservice actually results from the approval of particular occupational programs.

In general the State Vocational Office is dissatisfied with junior college counseling. Two years ago Mr. Fatheree offered reimbursement to counselors working half-time at high schools and half-time at a junior college. This has been only partially successful. There is evidence that some coordinators and counselors have been used for administrative purposes. It is hoped that this program can be expanded by adding more occupational counselors.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN STATE-LOCAL JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS

Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University, Tallahassee

Most of us would no doubt agree that the ultimate purpose to be served by public relations is to obtain and retain the confidence and support of constituents. Those who make public relations their business refer to these constitutents as "publics". There are several junior college "publics" that need to be reached by a public relations program. While overlapping in some cases, these publics consist of (1) legislatures, (2) local and state lay boards, (3) citizens of the state, (4) parents of students and potential students, (5) educators at other levels, especially the secondary and senior college levels, (6) junior college faculties, and (7) junior college students and potential students. Failure to reach effectively one or more of these groups is almost certain to sooner or later result in the loss of confidence and support for a given institution or an entire state junior college system.

These various publics constitute different targets toward which a public relations program needs to be aimed. They call for different types of information, methods of approach, and the involvement of different individuals. In all cases, however, they call for the combined efforts and close cooperation among the junior colleges of a state and between

junior colleges and the state agency which coordinates and provides overall leadership for a state system. This point has been emphasized by previous speakers at this conference.

Elements of an Effective Local-State Junior College Public Relations Program.

Maintaining this partnership between junior college presidents and the state director for junior colleges in the realm of public relations calls for cooperation in the following realms:

1. Exchange of statistical data. The state director collects systematically considerable data from individual junior colleges either because he must have it to carry out his legal responsibility--for example, to determine the allocation of state funds--or because it is important for developing a legislative program or for long-range planning. If reports of this compiled information is provided junior colleges, material from them can be used for local public relations.

2. Exchange of newsworthy information. "Success stories" are indispensable for an effective public relations program. Many of these relate to an individual institution; others are broader in scope including those of state-wide and national significance. Alertness to these "success stories" is needed at both the local and state levels along with a realization that they might be useful for public relations purposes at the other level. The American Association of Junior Colleges' staff in Washington is doing an outstanding job in this respect. They send state directors and presidents information that has excellent local and state level public relations value. Items contained in the Junior College Journal are also useful for this purpose.

Each president and the state director should assign an alert member of his staff (it can be a secretary) responsibility for systematically

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN STATE-LOCAL JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONSHIPS

Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University, Tallahassee

Most of us would no doubt agree that the ultimate purpose to be served by public relations is to obtain and retain the confidence and support of constituents. Those who make public relations their business refer to these constitutents as "publics". There are several junior college "publics" that need to be reached by a public relations program. While overlapping in some cases, these publics consist of (1) legislatures, (2) local and state lay boards, (3) citizens of the state, (4) parents of students and potential students, (5) educators at other levels, especially the secondary and senior college levels, (6) junior college faculties, and (7) junior college students and potential students. Failure to reach effectively one or more of these groups is almost certain to sooner or later result in the loss of confidence and support for a given institution or an entire state junior college system.

These various publics constitute different targets toward which a public relations program needs to be aimed. They call for different types of information, methods of approach, and the involvement of different individuals. In all cases, however, they call for the combined efforts and close cooperation among the junior colleges of a state and between

junior colleges and the state agency which coordinates and provides overall leadership for a state system. This point has been emphasized by previous speakers at this conference.

Elements of an Effective Local-State Junior College Public Relations Program.

Maintaining this partnership between junior college presidents and the state director for junior colleges in the realm of public relations calls for cooperation in the following realms:

1. Exchange of statistical data. The state director collects systematically considerable data from individual junior colleges either because he must have it to carry out his legal responsibility--for example, to determine the allocation of state funds--or because it is important for developing a legislative program or for long-range planning. If reports of this compiled information is provided junior colleges, material from them can be used for local public relations.

2. Exchange of newsworthy information. "Success stories" are indispensable for an effective public relations program. Many of these relate to an individual institution; others are broader in scope including those of state-wide and national significance. Alertness to these "success stories" is needed at both the local and state levels along with a realization that they might be useful for public relations purposes at the other level. The American Association of Junior Colleges' staff in Washington is doing an outstanding job in this respect. They send state directors and presidents information that has excellent local and state level public relations value. Items contained in the Junior College Journal are also useful for this purpose.

Each president and the state director should assign an alert member of his staff (it can be a secretary) responsibility for systematically

clipping newspaper articles and collecting other items of information such as programs of dramatic and musical productions, commencement, copies of the student paper and the like. (There is obvious merit in this being the same person who is responsible for collecting and filing information for the institution's or agency's cumulative history.) Many of these items or copies thereof should in turn be sent to the state director and conversely.

3. Utilize opportunities to support one another publicly. Individual junior college presidents and the state director for junior colleges have many opportunities to support one another. They should not be sensitive to the possibility of being referred to as a mutual admiration society. These opportunities are both formal and informal in nature and include lay and professional groups. Approaches which can be used are discussed later. Suffice it to say here that this constitutes a type of public relations that pays good dividends.

4. Present a common front on important issues. Nothing will damage a state's junior college system more than to have presidents either split among themselves or for them to take issue publicly with their state director on important issues. Such a split will largely negate the benefits of other positive public relations efforts. This does not mean that differences on important issues will not or should not occur. Rather, it means that they should fight these matters out among themselves and once a position or course of action is decided upon, support it individually and as a group. This isn't always easy but it is a basic principle of administration which most certainly applies to junior college presidents and their state director.

5. Avoid criticizing the system to others. Closely related to

the previous point is the importance of not undermining the system and individuals in it. The result of such a practice is often loss of confidence in the system. All parties involved suffer the consequences. This is not to suggest a fools paradise where everyone visualizes the status quo as a Utopian condition. Rather, it means that the presidents and the state director will be honest with one another on the weaknesses of the system. Further, they will devise methods to improve the system and commit themselves to get needed changes made. In the process, however, they will not engage in the insidious game of undermining one another or the system. This is not to imply that problems should not be laid before the various publics. They should be made aware of problems that exist as a means of gaining support for their solution. More will be said about this later.

Purposes Served by a Local-State Junior College Public Relations Program.

At the onset it was stated that the ultimate purpose of a public relations program is to obtain and retain the confidence and support of constituents. As a backdrop for the discussion which is to follow, specific purposes of a public relations program will be set forth. The more important of these are to:

1. Gain financial support. Presenting convincing evidence of financial needs calls for long-range planning and supporting data. These needs translated into dollars must be presented in a concise and clear manner. Legislators, boards, and voters should be presented both financial requirements and how they are derived.

Obviously, financial needs must be derived from the educational program which they will support. However, what constitutes adequate support is, as any president knows, difficult to establish to the satisfaction

of many lay people. Here is where effective use can be made of comparative data from other states. A well designed public relations program can help to get such information before the public. This is another place where the state director can provide valuable information to presidents for their use at the local level.

2. Gain support for the legislative program. In considerable measure the previous purpose is encompassed in this one. The welfare and progress of a state's junior college system is dependent in large measure, as you well know, upon the success of its legislative program. You are further aware that other state agencies and groups are also intent upon achieving their goals--in some cases at the expense of your program if necessary. Consequently, the importance of a well-conceived and effectively implemented legislative program cannot be overemphasized. This calls for close coordination between junior college presidents and the state director. In this connection, it is essential that responsibilities be assigned and strategy arrived at in advance of a legislative session. Even then while the legislature is in session, vigilance and prompt action are terribly important. The type of action this calls for at times goes beyond public relations but certainly public relations are very much involved.

3. Gain support for educational programs. Previous sessions of this conference have given attention to state-local relationships in the area of curriculum. The use of public relations to gain support for an educational program is frequently overlooked. This is especially important in the case of new occupational programs. Support needs to be obtained from the board and legislature to obtain financing, from students and their parents to obtain enrollments, and from the faculty to obtain acceptance

within the institution. If we fail to secure and maintain support from any one of these groups, needed occupational programs are likely to never get off the ground.

Junior college administrators do rather well in gaining the support of boards and legislators for new programs since this is necessary before the decision can be made to introduce such a program. The failure most often occurs with the other two groups. When a new program fails to attract students it is often--if not usually--because of inadequate or ineffective public relations with potential students and their parents. We don't seem to learn from sad experience that if a program for which there is great need is introduced, students will necessarily swarm to it. An effective public relations program is in my opinion the single most important device for attracting enrollment to a new program and enrollment is, of course, and essential condition for a program's success.

Such a public relations effort is most successful when it is joinly developed and conducted at the state and local levels. It can consist of attractive and informative brochures, audio-visual aids, releases through the news media and the like. Information and material now being distributed by the American Association of Junior Colleges is valuable for this purpose.

With faculty the situation is more subtle and the task, if anything, may be more difficult. We are all aware of the extent to which a faculty can sabotage a new program when they are strongly opposed to it. Here is where an outsider may be more effective than the president of an institution in winning their acceptance if not support. A state director of junior colleges in his contacts with faculty during visits to campuses can also be helpful in this respect. Further, he can issue statements

which presidents can use in their efforts to gain and retain faculty support for occupational programs.

4. Reports of accomplishments of institutions and the system. As was noted at the onset the most effective way to retain support of one's constitutents--in this case boards, legislators, parents, students, and senior colleges--is by accomplishments. Therefore, it is important that these accomplishments be made known to those groups. Doing this constitutes public relations.

Insofar as junior colleges are concerned, these accomplishments cover a wide spectrum including achievements of students and faculty, enrollment increases, new facilities, new programs, and the like. The "Junior College Story" in Mississippi is a success story and one that needs to be told again and again. Telling it effectively and adequately requires the joint efforts of junior colleges individually and collectively with the state director and his staff. Reference has previously been made to the fact that this entails the exchange of information. The approach should depend upon the "public" to which it is directed.

In Florida, Jim Wattenbarger has obtained excellent public relations mileage from his annual "State of the State" report given annually at the fall convention of the Florida Association of Public Junior Colleges.

Methods of Carrying out the Public Relations Program.

A number of methods have been suggested or implied for carrying out the public relations program set forth in this paper. The specifics in each case require expertise which I do not possess. By way of summary it is sufficient to enumerate and make brief comments about some of the more effective methods.

1. Personal contacts with individuals and groups. This you do

all the time and it has already been mentioned. The point to be reiterated here is that by exchanging information between the local and state levels these efforts will be enhanced.

2. Reports to boards and legislatures. Ample point has been made of the importance of keeping these groups informed. We sometimes overestimate, however, the amount of material that they will read. Conciseness and clarity in getting the message across to them cannot be overemphasized. Here is where drawing upon the expertise of those with special competency in illustrating and writing pays off.

3. News media. In addition to regular news broadcasts, radio and television stations are obligated to allocate time for public service purposes. They are often anxious for material and/or programs to utilize that time. There are wonderful opportunities for state-local cooperation in devising ways to capitalize on this situation. To cite one example, this has been done in Georgia where spot announcements are made over radio and television stations throughout the state on the need for workers with certain specialized competencies and the availability of programs to develop these competencies. Programs by student groups and/or members of the faculty are also excellent public relations devices. It would be a gross oversight not to mention newspapers in this connection.

4. Audio-visual materials. In a number of states, the agency for community colleges has assumed responsibility for the development and/or collection of audio-visual aids. These consist of films, filmstrips, slides, transparencies, pictures and the like. Such items are made available to junior colleges for local use. The Division of Community Colleges in Virginia has a very attractive display depicting their system and programs which is transported from institution to institution.

Summary

Hopefully, the impression has not been given that cooperation between junior college presidents and their state director is the answer to all of their needs. It is hoped, rather, that this paper has served (a) to point up the importance of the two groups working together in the realm of public relations, (b) to identify realms where such efforts can fruitfully be carried on; and (c) to indicate methods that can be employed to good advantage for carrying out such a public relations program.

LOCAL AND STATE RELATIONS

Louis W. Bender, Director
Bureau of Community Colleges
State Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

When Jim Wattenbarger called me several months ago and invited me to be here with you today, I initially deferred suggesting that a more appropriate speaker could and should be chosen. In attempting to reassure me, he explained, "Don't worry, Lou, it's just to be a simple program." My immediate reply was, "O.K., Jim, if you are looking for a simple speaker, you have your man."

Seriously, though, it is a privilege to be with you today, and I am happy to share with you the philosophy of organization of our State Office in Pennsylvania as well as some of my personal views on local and state relations. It is necessary first, however, to sketch briefly some principles upon which we attempted to develop the Community College Bureau in Pennsylvania. Prior to assuming that position, I studied the various state organizational patterns throughout the nation and traveled extensively to see at first hand selected state officials in order to review their procedures and philosophies for state-level coordination of community colleges.

It was obvious after only a few visits to recognize that there is great difference and diversity in approaches at the state level throughout the nation. This is testimony to what we in education have finally come to realize - there is more than one way to find solution to a given

problem and. thus, very different state coordinating agencies are successfully accommodating these institutions in various states.

Since I have always enjoyed history and sociology, I view the role of the state agency as maintaining a delicate balance of creative tensions. If you would mentally picture a version of the ancient fulcrum scales, you may visualize better what I mean.

Man's increasing proximity brought about by the shrinking of our world generates two conflicting forces which I would describe as creative tensions. We realize the advances in transportation and communication as well as the increases in population and urbanization are forces which throw man closer together and bring us closer to the one world-one people concept. Yet, we must recognize man has two conflicting forces which are at different ends of the scale. First, he has the instinct for self-preservation which, when carried to extremes, can be viewed as selfishness. But man has such a drive which directs many of his efforts. There are those who maintain this instinct so strong that it will be a final and constant obstruction to our most humanitarian ideals.

At the other extreme, man is a social being who is interdependent from the very day of birth. Man's instincts for the family unit, the tribal community, the more modern municipality, state and nation are all derived from this basic force.

I personally subscribe to the belief that the greater force of these two must and will be the latter. It was the noted theologian Harry Emerson Fosdick who once preached a great sermon on this very point. He concluded that the "our" and "we" must replace the "my" and "I" if we are to have social progress. He noted that our most fundamental allegiances

are directed toward "we" and "our". For example, when Jesus gave us the Lord's Prayer, he directed, "Ye shall pray, '<u>Our</u> Father, Who art in Heaven, ...'." Furthermore, when we sing our national anthem, we say, ".....so proudly <u>we</u> hail....<u>our</u> flag..." Most of us accept the fact we have come to that point in the history of man when he cannot live alone.

These two conflicting forces are inherent in the community-junior college. Each institution, on the one hand, has a self-preservation drive which makes it a most basic community institution. In fact, I sometimes say that community colleges have unusual legislative lobby potential because of a "motherhood-element". The legislator views his institution as his major concern, even to the detriment of the others. On the other hand, at the same time, community colleges must operate as a family unit if they are to realize their full potential and fulfill their philosophic mission.

Now let us consider the different family organizations so that I can draw an analogy for the development of the state coordinating agencies. We once lived near a large German family in which the Father ruled the home with Prussian discipline and precision. I frequently wondered how they could stand such a setting, but it was a successful and happy home then and now. The Father was always fair and in his own way loved each of his family members. Some years later we lived in another community where a neighbor family was the epitomy of a laissez-faire structure. There were some eleven children in the family, and I often wondered whether any one of the family members knew what the others were doing or whether they were even blood relatives. Yet, in their own way, this family found its way and experienced its successes, too.

On the other hand, most of us would subscribe to the balanced type of family organization where through democratic processes each member can be a part of the total unit and can expect the support of all fellow members. In this setting, each member realizes there will occasionally be sacrifices self-imposed for the total good of the entire family or for some of the several members. I could go on describing this ideal family structure, but it should be apparent that I am now outlining my own view of the operation of state level community-junior college coordination.

I subscribe to the tenant that the State Office will best perform its coordinating function through leadership services rather than through regulation and policing. In fact, I would personally be willing to have a family member actually over-extend himself to the point where the other members assist him in self-dicipline rather than police or direct centrally. This frequently can be a most perilous path for the reputation of the family rides on the shoulders of the State Office, particularly as it is expressed through the legislature and the Governor's Office. It takes courage to accept mistakes and to seek to use them as steps toward a stronger and more meaningful future.

I have attempted to give you the backdrop of the philosophy of our operation. Now I will describe the structure as provided by law.

In Pennsylvania we have a single State Board of Education which is made up of seventeen members with seven members serving as a Council for Basic Education and another seven serving as the Council for Higher Education. There are three members at large. These respective Councils deal with all aspects of education under their title. Similarly, there is a single department of education headed by a superintendent or secretary and then

two commissioners' offices, one for basic education and one for higher education. Under the Commissioner of Higher Education there are five bureaus, my Bureau being one of them. I believe that the philosophy I have outlined reflects the posture of the Commissioner of Higher Education, Dr. Frederic K. Miller. Commissioner Miller was president of a church-related, liberal arts college for some seventeen years and had been president of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities during the time when the legislature was creating the new State Board of Education and when that new Board was developing a Master Plan for Higher Education. He has been most supportive of the development of community colleges as well as the philosophy and direction of the operation of the Bureau.

Some of the basic assumptions related to the development of the Pennsylvania bureau are: (1) Local initiative, responsibility, and decision-making should be emphasized and preserved to the greatest possible extent. I find it difficult to use the term local autonomy for I feel it is frequently misleading. However, it would be appropriate here. (2) The State Office should be a coordination agency, not a controlling agency. (3) The major battle in providing and maintaining such coordination is communication between the local level and the state level. I have found that the almost inevitable lack of communication is primarily due to misunderstanding, different priorities, or laziness. I do not believe, however, that it is due to dishonesty which state government sometimes seems to assume as reflected in their various internal accounting and reporting procedures. Any of you who have ever completed an expense voucher or have attempted to submit all of the justifications required for ordering material and equipment would know what I mean. (4) The State Office must be the equalizer and guarantee equity within the system.

(5) The State Office must provide accountability for all state funds as well as for program evaluation. I would call this cost effectiveness.

The Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Dr. Lyman Glenny, said it very well in an address at Berkeley last summer, "The coordinating process is a political one, involving powerful social agencies, such as colleges and universities, with their historic intellectual independence and autonomy on the one side, and the central public policy-formulating authorities of the governor and legislature on the other."

"The coordinating agency situated between these two powerful political forces seeks to identify with both in order to achieve satisfactory solutions to developmental and financing problems of higher education. The agency role may appear to be strictly one of arbitration or of mediation, but it extends much further. Today, its principal legal duty is long-range planning for improving educational quality and for expanding programs and facilities. The responsible exercise of that power necessarily takes from both the universities and the state authorities a valued traditional function; this, in turn, provides the coordinating agency the means to political leadership. The policies and programs of a coordinating agency must rest on expert fact-finding and a broad range of relevant studies made by task forces composed of scholars in the institutions involved associated with lay citizens representing a wide range of public interests and activities. If a coordinating agency is effective, it will keep both legislators and institutions from achieving parochial interests."

Most of you already know the ongoing roles of the central agency, but I would briefly review a few at this point.

The first would be that on a consultative or interpretative role. There is no better vantage point than the State Office for an overview of

the family of colleges nor any better focal point for interpretation of their mission, nature, successes, or problems. Furthermore, new or developing institutions find a state agency valuable for consultative assistance whether it be direct or through utilization of outside expertise. A second role is that of research and information services. This is the single most neglected or poorly supported of the roles I have observed directly in Pennsylvania and indirectly in other states. However, there is need to gather and maintain all types of information and data which will assist in determining the success or failure of the programs, services, and facilities of the colleges. We in Pennsylvania have attempted to avoid any type of "form-itis" whereby the colleges encounter the burden of completing forms or reports which often seems to be a characteristic of state and federal government. Therefore, we have deliberately curtailed formal reporting and forms to only two. They are the budget requests and the request for site or physical facility construction approvals. All other information is done through informal means by the Bureau staff working with the various administrative levels of the colleges through councils or coordinating committees. For example, the accounting system used by Pennsylvania was developed cooperatively by the Business Officials with Bureau staff acting as the chairmen. We are now doing the same thing with our Deans of Occupational and Continuing Education since we have recently received approval and authorization to administer that portion of Federal Vocational Education funds - 88-210 - which are identified by the State Board for Vocational Education for use by community colleges. I would note, however, that too frequently colleges are derelict even in providing the few descriptive reports requested to enhance the overall program. For example, recently the legislature called upon the Commissioner for Higher

Education to give a report of the efforts of colleges and universities to accommodate the disadvantaged. Each of the twelve Presidents were notified of the nature and reason for the request together with a request for a description of what was being done or contemplated for the future in serving the disadvantaged. After two weeks and two phone call follow-ups, we still had only six institution reports to be submitted to the Commissioner. It is in this setting that local colleges forfeit the democratic posture and invite greater structure and regimentation from the state level since legislators are going to have their report one way or another. I hope that you Presidents here will seriously explore your mode of operation and do some soul searching when it seems inconvenient or cumbersome to respond to a request from your State Office.

A third role is that of administering state aid. In Pennsylvania the Commonwealth pays one-third of the operating costs up to a maximum of $1,000 per full-time student equivalent; the student pays one-third in the form of tuition; and the local sponsor pays one-third. The capital funds are shared fifty per cent by the State and fifty per cent by the local community. This role is the only administering role which we find necessitates occasional judgment at the state level. For example, we have had the experience where some colleges have proposed new construction at excessive per square foot construction costs. It is necessary then to place a ceiling on the amount of State aid that can be paid. Again I believe the real problem here is the extent to which each institution views its responsibility to the total family and the extent of responsibility which it assumes in this regard.

A fourth role is that of system planning and coordination whether it be for personnel, curriculum, site or location, or articulation with

baccalaureate institutions.

A final role which I would call to your attention is that of program evaluation, particularly as it relates to the Master Plan for Higher Education and determining regional priorities for curriculum.

Although I am viewed as an idealist by many, I believe that I am also a pragmatic realist. There are problems of operating a central agency without assuming control or regulatory prerogatives. Furthermore, it is easier for some college presidents to operate under a highly structured and centralized situation because of the built-in scapegoat provision. It makes a convenient escape route for the administrator who finds it difficult to solve his own problems.

Finally, I recognize that change is constant, and that there will need to be reappraisal of our total operation from time to time. There are bound to be inadvertent forces and pressures for more control and more red tape at the state level. I would hope, however, through good will and through an effective and constant communication system between each institution and the State Office, we can enjoy the fruits of our family efforts. After all, community-junior college education exists for only one purpose, <u>service to the student</u>.